

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	1
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	2
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	2
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	2
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	3
VII. ARGUMENT	4
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX	15
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	20
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	21

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46320
	:	
Velda BARTEK, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 7782
	:	
Application No.: 10/754,375	:	Group Art Unit: 2173
	:	
Filed: January 9, 2004	:	Examiner: N. Ulrich
	:	
For: DYNAMIC COMPOSITION OF HELP INFORMATION FOR AN AGGREGATION OF APPLICATIONS		

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed January 3, 2008, wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-16.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to IBM Corporation by assignment recorded on January 9, 2004, at Reel 014888, Frame 0279.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-16 are pending and three-times rejected in this Application. It is from the multiple rejections of claims 1-18 that this Appeal is taken.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have not been amended subsequent to the imposition of the Third and Final Office Action dated October 3, 2007 (hereinafter the Third Office Action).

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Referring to Figure 4 and also to independent claims 1 and 11, a method (and machine readable storage for implementing the method) for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications is disclosed. In blocks 420-430, at least two separate help documents are obtained, and each of the at least two separate help documents having an association with a corresponding one of separate interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view (lines 1-7 of paragraph [0036]). In block 445, the at least two separate help documents are combined into a composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0037]). In block 480, the composition of help documents is rendered in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in the single aggregated view (lines 8-10 of paragraph [0038]).

Referring to Figure 1 and also to independent claim 7, a system for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications is disclosed. The system includes an application aggregator 130, a help system 140, and help invoking logic 170. The application aggregator 130 is configured to aggregate individual interface units 110 into a single aggregated

1 view 150 (lines 1-6 of paragraph [0026]). The help system 140 is configured to render a help
2 system view 160 comprising composite help documentation 190 comprising at least two help
3 documents 120, each of the at least two help documents 120 corresponding to one of the
4 individual interface units 110 (lines 1-6 of paragraph [0027]). The help invoking logic 170 is
5 coupled to the help system 140 and disposed in the single aggregated view 150 (lines 1-5 of
6 paragraph [0028]).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13, and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,351,361 (hereinafter Hickman), in view of Lillie et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0065913 (hereinafter Lillie); and

2. Claims 2, 4, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie and Palaniappan et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054152 (hereinafter Palaniappan).

VII. ARGUMENT

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5-11, 13, AND 15-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR
OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON HICKMAN IN VIEW OF LILLIE**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 5-6, 11, and 15-16 stand or fall together with independent claim 1; claim 13 stands or falls together with claim 3; and claims 8-10 stand or fall together with independent claim 7.

As is evident from Appellants' previously-presented comments during prosecution of the present Application and from Appellants' comments below, there are questions as to how the limitations in the claims correspond to features in the applied prior art. In this regard, reference is made to M.P.E.P. § 1207.02, entitled "Contents of Examiner's Answer." Specifically, the following is stated:

(A) CONTENT REQUIREMENTS FOR EXAMINER'S ANSWER. The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

...

(9)(e) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 where there are questions as to how limitations in the claims correspond to features in the prior art even after the examiner complies with the requirements of paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, the examiner must compare at least one of the rejected claims feature by feature with the prior art relied on in the rejection. The comparison must align the language of the claim side-by-side with a reference to the specific page, line number, drawing reference number, and quotation from the prior art, as appropriate. (emphasis added)

Therefore, if the Examiner is to maintain the present rejections and intends to file an Examiner's Answer, the Examiner is required to include the aforementioned section in the Examiner's Answer.

Claim 1

On pages 2-4 of the Request for Reconsideration filed July 16, 2007 (hereinafter the Second Response), Appellants presented the following arguments. In the third full paragraph on page 3 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner admitted the following:

Hickman fails to disclose "interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view", "help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view", and "rendering responsive to a request for help initiated in said single aggregated view".

Obviousness is a legal conclusion based on underlying facts of four general types, all of which must be considered by the trier of fact: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the art; (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (4) any objective indicia of nonobviousness.¹ Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to properly characterize regarding (1) the scope and content of the prior art and (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. In particular, Hickman fails to teach a composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view and rendering the composition of help documents responsive to a request for help initiated in the single aggregated view.

In the fourth full paragraph on page 3 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner asserted the following with regard to the teachings of Lillie:

However, Lillie discloses interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view (*Fig 5 and Paragraph 0054 lines 5-12: four portlets are aggregated to one portal view*); help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0058: Help files can be linked. It is inherent that these help files would correspond the portlets within the portal page*); and rendering help files responsive to request for help initiated in single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0058: input and output mechanisms can be employed for various communications. Help files can be linked for manual invocation*) (emphasis in original)

¹ See *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1270, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1750-51 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1566-68, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1594 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Finally, in the first full paragraph on page 4 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner concluded the obviousness analysis as follows:

Lillie does not explicitly explain the operation of the help files associated with the portal page but does discuss the inclusion of such a feature. Since both Hickman and Lillie's field of endeavor deal with aggregating multiple computer content together, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lillie and Hickman in order to create a single help file directory associated with an aggregate application like a portal. It would also be obvious to modify Hickman's invention to populate a list of installed applications present in the portal page rather than programs installed within the entire system.

At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner has submitted a substantially flawed analysis. In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner is required to identify a source in the applied prior art for: (1) claim limitations; and (2) the motivation to combine references or modify a reference in the reasonable expectation of achieving a particular benefit.² The Examiner, however, has failed to establish that either Hickman or Lillie teach or suggest the claimed composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to establish what is the particular benefit that one having ordinary skill in the art would enjoy based upon this combination. Thus, the Examiner has identified a source in Lillie for neither the claimed composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view nor a particular benefit associated with this modification.

As an aside, Appellants are unclear as the Examiner statement that "it would also be obvious to modify Hickman's invention to populate a list of installed applications present in the portal page rather than programs installed within the entire system." What is the "list of installed applications present in the portal page" being populated with?

² Smiths Industries Medical System v. Vital Signs Inc., 183 F.3d 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

1 In response to Appellants' arguments that Hickman fails to teach a composition of help
2 documents corresponding to the single aggregated view and rendering the composition of help
3 documents responsive to a request for help initiated in the single aggregated view, the Examiner
4 asserted the following in the paragraph spanning pages 11 and 12 of the Third Office Action:

5 Hickman's invention is directed towards aggregating a plurality of help documents that represent
6 applications that are installed on a given operating system. This is accomplished by determining a
7 list of application programs installed within the system, extract help topic descriptors from each of
8 the applications on the list, and combining them into hierarchal help utility storage area for
9 retrieval by a user. Lillie's invention is directed towards portal pages with aggregate a plurality of
10 portlets into a single aggregated view. It is well known in the art that portlets are applications that
11 are managed and displayed by a portal page. When combining Hickman's and Lillie's invention, it
12 would be obvious to aggregate the help files associated with the portlets. First, as discussed in the
13 rejection of claim 1, a list of portlets present in a given aggregated view (portal page) would be
14 obtained from the portal configuration of Lillie's invention. Then Hickman's invention would
15 extract the help topics for each of the portlets present within the portal configuration, and then
16 combine them into a hierarchal help utility storage area for retrieval by a user. By combining the
17 single aggregated view of Lillie's invention, with the methods of Hickman's invention, we would
18 reach the claimed limitation of a composition of help documents corresponding to a single
19 aggregated view.
20

21 At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner is presenting two inconsistent assertions in the
22 Third Office Action. In the first full paragraph on page 3 of the Third Office Action, the
23 Examiner is asserting that Hickman, alone, teaches the claimed limitation at issue (i.e.,
24 combining the help documents into a composition and rendering the composition). However, in
25 the above-reproduced passage, the Examiner is now asserting that the combination of Hickman
26 and Lillie teaches this limitation.

27
28 Regarding the Examiner's assertion that "Lillie's invention is directed towards portal
29 pages with aggregate a plurality of portlets into a single aggregated view," Appellants do not
30 disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of Lilly. As is very well-known in
31 the art, portlets are individual views that can be aggregated into a single aggregated view (i.e., a
32 portal). This is comparable to what is disclosed in Fig. 2 of Appellants' specification, which

shows three portals (i.e., Portlet 1, Portlet 2, Portlet 3), each with its own view, and aggregated into a single view 210.

Appellants, however, vigorously disagree with the Examiner's assertion that "it would be obvious to aggregate the help files associated with the portlets ... as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, a list of portlets present in a given aggregated view (portal page) would be obtained from the portal configuration of Lillie's invention." An aggregation of portlets (as taught by Lillie and found in Appellants' own specification), however, is not comparable to the claimed composition of help documents. Referring to the top image in Fig. 2 of Appellants' specification, an aggregation 210 of portlets shows that the portlets are separate entities with their own view. In contrast, the lower image in Fig. 2 of Appellants' specification shows that the composition 270 of help documents (i.e., 280A, 280B, 280C) is a single entity with its own view. Therefore, as evidenced by Appellants' own specification, an aggregation of portlets is not comparable to the claimed composition of help documents. Therefore, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine the applied prior art, based upon the teachings of the applied prior art the claimed invention would not result since the resultant combination would not disclose all of the claimed limitations.

In response to Appellants' arguments the Examiner has failed to establish what is the particular benefit that one having ordinary skill in the art would enjoy based upon this combination, the Examiner asserted the following in the paragraph spanning pages 11 and 12 of the Third Office Action:

In this case, one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Hickman and Lillie in order to combine various help utilities for applications present on a given system, into a unified interface which hierarchically defines all the help information available to a user, as suggested by Hickman (Column 1 lines 24-47).

Appellants are unclear why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been impelled to modify Hickman in view of Lillie based upon this asserted motivation described by Hickman. The teachings of Hickman are already directed to "providing a hierarchical integrated help utility that integrates help information across multiple independent applications" (see column 1, lines 51-53 of Hickman). Thus, any modification based upon Lillie would be redundant to the solving of the problem already allegedly solved by Hickman and would not have realistically impelled one having ordinary skill in the art to make the modification.³

In addition to the above-reproduced statement, the Examiner further asserted the following:

Both Hickman's and Lillie's invention deal with aggregating computer content together. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill having the teachings of Hickman and Lillie before him to modify Hickman's invention to aggregate the help files of applications present within a portal page. As discussed in the background section of Hickman's invention, application programs are developed by more than one software vendor, which result in various help utility implementations. This can also be said for portal pages. Portal pages are made of diverse portlets, which are applications that can be developed by a plurality of software vendors. Therefore, as discussed by Hickman, there is a need to aggregate help files associated with a plurality of applications, in order to obtain a single unified interface for accessing help files of a plurality of application programs.

At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner has overreached in characterizing the teachings of Hickman and Lillie. Referring to Fig. 3, Hickman teaches aggregating help file directories 313, 323 into a single integrated help utility 340. However, the help files 312, 322 are not integrated into a composition of help documents, as claimed. Instead, a user, using a help viewer 320, accesses the integrated help utility 340 to separately access each of the help files 312, 322.

³ See the non-precedential opinion of Ex parte Rinkevich, Appeal 2007-1317 ("we conclude that a person of ordinary skill in the art *having common sense* at the time of the invention would not have reasonably looked to Wu to solve a problem already solved by Savill") (emphasis in original).

In comparing Fig. 3 of Hickman to Fig. 2 of Hickman (Hickman considers Fig. 2 to be prior art), there is no change in how Hickman treats the separate help files 212, 222. Lillie, on the other hand, teaches the very well-known concept that separate portlet views can be aggregated into a portal. However, portlets and help documents are not comparable and the Examiner has failed to establish that the teachings as to portlets are applicable to help documents.

The Examiner's assertion that "there is a need to aggregate help files associated with a plurality of applications, in order to obtain a single unified interface for accessing help files of a plurality of application programs" is both factually unsupported by the teachings of the applied prior art and still would not have led to the claimed invention. The Examiner has still failed to point to where the prior art identifies "a need to aggregate help files associated with a plurality of applications." Moreover, obtaining "a single unified interface for accessing help files of a plurality of application programs" is already described by Hickman (and thus the teachings of Lillie would be redundant/unnecessary). Furthermore, the single unified interface for accessing help files, as already taught by Hickman, does not require a composition of help documents since Hickman shows that the help documents are not a composition.

Claim 3

On pages 4 and 5 of the Second Response, Appellants presented the following arguments. Dependent claims 3 and 13 each recite, in part, the following limitations:

rendering both a view of said composition of help documents, and individual views of said separate help documents. (emphasis added)

To teach these limitations, the Examiner cited column 6, lines 64, 66, which state "[t]hus, the present invention integrates the display and selection of help directory information from multiple applications into a single window." The Examiner further stated the following:

The display of help information is performed by help viewer while the selection of help information is performed by the integrated help utility (bookcase) Both are present in a single window on the display system.

Appellants note that the above assertion is not supported by the Examiner's cited passage within Hickman. Moreover, even if this assertion was supported, it does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations recited in claims 3 and 13. The claimed invention recites that at least three views are rendered: (i) the composition of help documents and (ii)/(iii) individual views (i.e., a plurality of views, which constitutes two or more views). Not only are these at least three views not disclosed as being rendered by Hickman, Appellants are unclear as to which of the claimed views the alleged "selection of help information is performed by the integrated help utility" corresponds.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner asserted the following in the paragraph spanning pages 13 and 14 of the Third Office Action:

In regard to applicant's argument that Hickman does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 3 and 13, the examiner disagrees. Applicant asserts that claims 3 and 13 teach rendering at least three views: (i) the composition of help documents and (ii)/(iii) individual views of help documents. Examiner cited column 6 lines 64-66 of Hickman's disclosure, which states, "the present invention integrates the display and selection of help directory information from multiple applications into a single window". This cited passage is further explained in Figure 5 of Hickman's disclosure. Figure 5 clearly shows composition of help documents (Bookcase Help) and individual views of separate help documents (application 1 and 2). The cited passage describes the selection of help directory information, This is accomplished from the composition of help documents displayed in the Bookcase. The passage further describes the display of help directory information. By selecting a topic listed in the bookcase, the help information is displayed within a window represented in figure 5. The passage further states integrated into a single window. Therefore, the composition of help documents and individual views of separate help documents are all displayed within a single window all at once.

The Examiner's analysis is predicated upon a faulty finding of fact. Referring to the underlined passage above and Fig. 5, Hickman does not teach rendering individual views of separate help

documents, as alleged by the Examiner. Instead, "APPLICATION 1" and "APPLICATION 2."
Referring to column 6, lines 4-8, what are being illustrated are applications and not help files.

Claim 7

On page 7 of the Office Action, with regard to the claimed "help invoking logic coupled to said help system and disposed in said single aggregated view," the Examiner cited Column 7, lines 14-29 of Hickman. However, upon reviewing the Examiner's cited passage, Appellants are unclear where, specifically, Hickman teaches that the help invoking logic is disposed in the single aggregated view. With regard to the Examiner's obviousness analysis, Appellants incorporate herein, as also applying to claim 7, the arguments previously presented with regard to the Examiner's obviousness analysis as to claim 1 since the Examiner used the same analysis with claim 7 as the Examiner used with claim 1.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner asserted the following in the first full paragraph on page 14 of the Third Office Action:

In regard to applicant's argument of claim 7, the examiner disagrees. With regard to the combination of Hickman and Lillie, examiner incorporates herein, the response to the first argument. Also, to better explain the help invoking logic, examiner has cited the passage (Column 6 lines 37-47) from Hickman's disclosure. Explained in this passage is the ability for a user to select a particular help topic for viewing.

The Examiner's analysis is ignoring the actual claim language at issue. Claim 7 does not recite "invoking help from single aggregated view" (i.e., "the ability for a user to select a particular help topic for viewing"). Instead, claim 7 recites help invoking logic disposed in the single aggregated view. These features are not taught by the Examiner's cited passage.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 4, 12, AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON HICKMAN IN VIEW OF LILLIE AND PALANIAPPAN**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 2, 4, 12, and 14 stand or fall together with independent claim 1.

Claims 2, 4 and 12, 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 11, and Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie. The tertiary reference to Palaniappan does not cure the argued deficiencies of Hickman and Lillie. Accordingly, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were impelled to combine the applied prior art, the claimed invention would not result. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 2, 4 and 12, 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie and Palaniappan is not viable.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon the applied prior art is not viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Application No.: 10/754,375

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

Phone: (561) 922-3845

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications, the method comprising the steps of:

obtaining at least two separate help documents, each of said at least two separate help documents having an association with a corresponding one of separate interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view;

combining said at least two separate help documents into a composition of help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view; and,

rendering said composition of help documents in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in said single aggregated view.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said rendering step further comprises the steps of:

loading an index produced from a navigation view disposed within said single aggregated view;

forming a help system navigation view based upon said index; and,

rendering said help system navigation view along with said rendering of said composition of help documents.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein said rendering step comprises the step of rendering both a view of said composition of help documents, and individual views of said separate help documents.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein said rendering step further comprises the steps of:

- obtaining an image map of said single aggregated view;
- rendering said image map in a help system view;
- activating a rendering of said view of said composition of help documents responsive to a selection of a portion of said image map not formed from a view of one of said separate interface units; and,
- otherwise activating a rendering of a single one of said individual views of said separate help documents responsive to a selection of a portion of said image map formed from a view of a corresponding one of said separate interface units.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

- updating said single aggregated view to include at least one different interface unit;
- changing said composition of help documents to include a new separate help document corresponding to said at least one different interface unit; and,
- rendering said changed composition of help documents in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in said updated single aggregated view.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of restricting help information in said composition of help documents for a particular user to reflect restrictions in said single aggregated view imposed upon said user.

7. A system for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications comprising:

an application aggregator configured to aggregate individual interface units into a single aggregated view;

a help system configured to render a help system view comprising composite help documentation comprising at least two help documents, each of said at least two help documents corresponding to one of said individual interface units; and,

help invoking logic coupled to said help system and disposed in said single aggregated view.

8. The system of claim 7, wherein said individual interface units are application portlets, wherein said single aggregated view is a portal, and wherein said application aggregator is disposed within a portal server.

9. The system of claim 7, wherein said help system is configured as a plug-in to an integrated development environment.

10. The system of claim 7, wherein said help system further comprises a configuration for generating a personalized bookshelf for said at least two help documents.

11. A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions which when executed by the machine cause the machine to perform the steps of:

obtaining at least two separate help documents, each of said at least two separate help documents having an association with a corresponding one of separate interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view;

combining said at least two separate help documents into a composition of help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view; and,

rendering said composition of help documents in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in said single aggregated view.

12. The machine readable storage of claim 11, wherein said rendering step further comprises the steps of:

loading an index produced from a navigation view disposed within said single aggregated view;

forming a help system navigation view based upon said index; and,

rendering said help system navigation view along with said rendering of said composition of help documents.

13. The machine readable storage of claim 11, wherein said rendering step comprises the step of rendering both a view of said composition of help documents, and individual views of said separate help documents.

14. The machine readable storage of claim 13, wherein said rendering step further comprises the steps of:

obtaining an image map of said single aggregated view;

rendering said image map in a help system view;

activating a rendering of said view of said composition of help documents responsive to a selection of a portion of said image map not formed from a view of one of said separate interface units; and,

otherwise activating a rendering of a single one of said individual views of said separate help documents responsive to a selection of a portion of said image map formed from a view of a corresponding one of said separate applications.

15. The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the steps of:

updating said single aggregated view to include at least one different interface unit;

changing said composition of help documents to include a new separate help document corresponding to said at least one different interface unit; and,

rendering said changed composition of help documents in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in said updated single aggregated view.

16. The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the step of restricting help information in said composition of help documents for a particular user to reflect restrictions in said single aggregated view imposed upon said user.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellants in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.